

is interesting to me that had this bill been introduced and also included a provision to raise the cost of any one of these courts that is dealt with in Chapter 24 which 271 deals with or to reduce the fees or whatever would have been felt to be all right. But because it is an amendment that Senator Beutler and others may not like, they want to have it defeated on the basis of not being germane which I think is not appropriate. If it were earlier in the session, I think I could probably get a better shot at this. By being late in the session, I think I have said about all that I can say that would tend to persuade anybody so I am asking that the Chair be overruled and that my motion, remember, you are not voting in favor of my motion now, just for the right to have a vote on it, that what I am talking about deals with courts, the fees and costs that are involved. Chapter 24 which 271 deals with deals with the courts, their organization, and specifically mentions fees and costs in the county court so I think the two ideas are connected and interrelated. So I am asking that the Chair be overruled and, Mr. Chairman, how many votes would it take to accomplish that purpose.

SPEAKER NICHOL: 24, last count.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Schmit. Senator Schmit, did you wish to talk on the motion? Senator Newell.

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I knew that if I waited long enough there would be an issue I felt the need to talk on. Earlier today there just wasn't one of those issues and I would like to rise to speak in favor of overruling the Chair, especially in regards to his ruling regarding 271 and the germaneness issue. I would like to make it clear that I don't intend to vote for Senator Chambers' motion because I don't think it contributes anything to LB 271 even though philosophically I am in agreement with him on the issue of court costs and fees. I have been very distressed that this Legislature has found the court costs and fees as a way to raise money each and every year. We found it about five years ago and we have tapped it everytime we have had a chance and I don't think we have let a session go by. So in regards to the marriage, the necessity of Senator Chambers' motion, even though I am in philosophical agreement, I am going to oppose the motion. But as regards to the question of whether the Chair is correct in his ruling, we started out the year, I just want to show you a little bit about where the evolution